arXiv:1606.04700v2 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 11 Oct 2016

Decay of density waves in coupled one-dimensional many-body-localized systems

Peter Prelovšek[1,2]
[1] *Jožef Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia and*
[2] *Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

The behavior of coupled disordered one-dimensional systems, as modelled by identical fermionic Hubbard chains with the on-site potential disorder and coupling emerging through the inter-chain hopping t', is analysed. The study is motivated by the experiment on fermionic cold atoms on a disordered lattice, where a decay rate of the quenched density wave was measured. We present a derivation of the decay rate Γ within perturbation theory and show that even at large disorder along the chains the interaction leads to finite $\Gamma > 0$, the mechanism being the interaction-induced coupling of in-chain localized and inter-chain extended single-fermion states. Explicit expressions for Γ are presented for a weak interaction $U < t, t'$, but extended also to the regime $t > U > t'$. It is shown that in both regimes Γ increases with the inter-chain hopping t', as well as decreases with increasing disorder.

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a, 71.30.+h, 71.10.Fd

I. INTRODUCTION

The paradigm of the many-body localization (MBL) represents the extension of well understood single-particle Anderson localization[1–3] to fermionic systems with a repulsive interaction. While original proposals for the MBL state were dealing with systems with a weak disorder[4,5], by now numerous theoretical studies confirm the existence of a MBL-like state in the regime of strong disorder and moderate interactions. Most studies so far were performed by the numerical investigation of the prototype model, being the one-dimensional (1D) model of disordered interacting spinless fermions, equivalent to the anisotropic Heisenberg chain with random local fields,[6–17]. Results confirm that for large disorder $W > W_c$ systems reveal some basic features of the MBL, referring here to those relevant also for experiments : a) the absence of d.c. transport at any temperature T[9,10,16,18–22], b) generally nonergodic behavior of correlation functions and of quenched initial quantum states[11,13,23–27], c) the area law instead of volume law for entropy, still with a logarithmic growth in the MBL phase[7,12,25,27,28]. Even within apparently simple 1D models there are essential theoretical and numerical challenges, among them also the nature of the MBL transition, e.g., well defined phase transition[11,25,29–31] vs. sharp crossover[10,21], and the prediction of measurable signatures of the MBL transition.

On the other hand, cold atoms in optical lattices have already provided a direct experimental insight into the MBL phenomenon and have shown the qualitative transition between an ergodic and the nonergodic phase. Studies of 1D disordered systems of cold atoms[24,32] have been recently extended to coupled 1D systems[33] as well to systems with a full two-dimensional (2D) disorder[34]. The motivation for this work is the former experiment which clearly reveals that in coupled chains of localized fermions with identical disorder, the fermion interaction U leads to the decay and the thermalization of the initial density-wave (DW) state. This implies also that the 1D nonergodic behavior is destroyed in the presence of $U \neq 0$ by the inter-chain coupling provided that there is no inter-chain disorder. Such an observation and its understanding may be very important for further explorations of the MBL physics in higher dimensions. Theoretically, there are few studies discussing MBL physics beyond 1D, e.g. in ladders[35] and in 2D systems[36]. We should also note that for cold-atom systems the appropriate model is the Hubbard model, which is much less explored with respect to possibility of MBL physics[36–38] and might even reveal some qualitative differences (taking into account additional symmetries[39]) relative to prototype disordered spinless models predominantly studied so far.

In this paper we show on the example of coupled identical disordered Hubbard chains that the decay mechanism of the initial out-of-equilibrium state is related to the Hubbard interaction U, coupling the in-chain localized and inter-chain extended single-particle states. In particular, we formulate the analytical procedure for the calculation of the decay of an initial density-wave (DW) state, as relevant for cold-atom experiment[33]. In the latter the measured quantity is time-dependent imbalance $I(\tau)$. The breaking of the ergodicity of the latter, i.e., $I(\tau \to \infty) > 0$ can be considered as a measurable order parameter for the nonergodic state. We do not address here in more detail the possible (or at least slow) decay of initial DW state in uncoupled chains. We show, however, that the inter-chain coupling introduces even for large disorder a relevant and leading additional decay channel for DW decay.

In Sec. II we present the model and its representation within the basis of 1D localized states. We introduce also the relevant DW operators studied further on. Sec. III is devoted to the derivation of the DW decay rate within the perturbation theory, leading to an approximation in terms of a Fermi-golden-rule expression. Sec. IV presents results within the perturbative regime $U \ll t, t'$ for the DW rate for the case of coupled chains, touching also the relation to the problem of 1D DW decay and possible generalizations. Conclusions are given in Sec. V.

II. MODEL

To remain close to the experiment[33] we consider in the following the (repulsive) fermion Hubbard model on coupled

chains where the disorder is identical in all chains,

$$H = \sum_j H_{0j} - t' \sum_{ljs} (c^\dagger_{l,j+1,s} c_{lj,s} + \text{H.c.}) + H_U,$$
$$H_{0j} = -t \sum_{ls} (c^\dagger_{l+1,j,s} c_{lj,s} + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_l h_l n_{lj}$$
$$H_U = U \sum_{lj} n_{lj\uparrow} n_{lj\downarrow}, \quad (1)$$

with the in-chain (site index l) and inter-chain (chain index j) nearest-neighbor (n.n.) hopping $t, t' > 0$, respectively. $n_{lj} = \sum_s n_{ljs}$ and we assume the disorder entering via random and independent local potentials $-W < h_l < W$, the same in all chains. We note that within the actual experiment[33] h_l are quasi-random. For further analysis it is relevant that we consider the filling $\bar{n} < 1$ (in the actual experiment $\bar{n} \sim 1/2$), avoiding the scenario of an (Mott) insulating state entirely due to repulsive $U > 0$. Further on we also consider only the case of weaker inter-chain hopping $t' < t$.

Let us start by considering a single 1D chain as described by H_{0j} in Eq. (1), where we omit for simplicity the index j. One can find first single-particle eigenfunctions of H_0 which are localized states for $W > 0$,

$$|\phi_{ms}\rangle = \varphi^\dagger_{ms}|0\rangle = \sum_l \phi_{ml} c^\dagger_{ls}|0\rangle, \quad H_0 = \sum_{ms} \epsilon_m \tilde{n}_{ms}, \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{n}_{ms}$ is the occupation of the single-particle localized state. One can then represent H_U in terms of such localized states,

$$H_U = U \sum_{mm'nn'} \chi^{m'n'}_{mn} \varphi^\dagger_{m'\uparrow} \varphi^\dagger_{n'\downarrow} \varphi_{n\downarrow} \varphi_{m\uparrow},$$
$$\chi^{m'n'}_{mn} = \sum_l \phi_{m'l} \phi_{n'l} \phi_{nl} \phi_{ml}, \quad (3)$$

where coefficients $\chi^{m'n'}_{mn}$ are by construction invariant on the index permutation, and indices m, m', n, n' further on refer to 1D localized basis, ordered conveniently by the position of the maxima of localized functions.

Let us consider many-body (MB) states $|\underline{m}\rangle = \prod_{\underline{m}} \varphi^\dagger_{ms}|0\rangle$ within such a localized basis. In this representation one term is the diagonal (Hartree-Fock) correction

$$H'_d = U \sum_{mn} \chi^{mn}_{mn} \tilde{n}_{n\uparrow} \tilde{n}_{m\downarrow}, \quad (4)$$

so that we can separate $H_U = H'_d + H''$, and only $H'' \neq 0$ can mix different $|\underline{m}\rangle$.

Our goal is the behavior of the staggered DW operator, defined by

$$A = \sum_l (-1)^l n_l / \sqrt{L}, \quad (5)$$

In particular, we wish to follow its time dependence, being directly related to the measured imbalance $I(\tau) \propto \langle A \rangle(\tau)$ emerging from an initial state $\langle A \rangle(\tau = 0) \neq 0$. Starting in experiment[24,33] as well as in numerical studies[24,37], with a DW eigenstate $A|\Psi_0\rangle = A_0|\Psi_0\rangle$, leads to fast initial dynamics (including oscillations) on the timescale $\tau \sim 1/t$, representing the decomposition of $|\Psi_0\rangle$ into diferent localized $|\underline{m}\rangle$. We are rather interested in long-time decay, beyond the former short-time transient, which is qualitatively of the form $I(\tau) = I_0(\tau)\exp(-\Gamma\tau)$. In particular, we study decay-rate Γ emerging from the dominant channel due to the interchain coupling, as appears also in the experiment[33]. For such long-time decay it is more convenient to analyze the modified DW operator, given already in terms of localized states,

$$B = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{ms} (-1)^m \tilde{n}_{ms}. \quad (6)$$

We can for convenience assume that localized states are ordered by the site m where they have maximum amplitude. It is evident that in the case $H'' = 0$, the initial state $|\underline{m}\rangle$ would not decay as well as $\langle B(\tau)\rangle$ would be constant, in contrast to more standard definition via Eq. (5).

III. DENSITY-WAVE DECAY RATE: DERIVATION

The goal is to evaluate $\langle B(\tau)\rangle$ when perturbed from the initial value $\langle B\rangle_0 = 0$. In actual experiment the deviation can be and actually is large[33]. Still we assume that the system under consideration (as well as in experiment[33]) is ergodic and approaches the thermal equilibrium. Final DW decay rate should be therefore determined by the equilibrium and consistent with an analytical approach to the problem we therefore apply the linear-response theory for the DW decay to the equilibrium, as characterized by the temperature $T > 0$ and the average particle density $\bar{n}$. The information is then contained within susceptibility for the modified DW observable, i.e.

$$\chi_B(\omega) = -i \int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{i\omega t} \langle [B(t), B] \rangle, \quad (7)$$

To derive the expression for the DW decay rate Γ within perturbation theory, as used e.g. for the dynamical conductivity[40], we follow the memory function formalism[40–42], since it has the advantage to be easily extended to nonergodic cases (as expeced within the MBL phase). Besides $\chi_B(\omega)$ we define in ususal way the relaxation function $\phi_B(\omega)$[40–42] and static (thermodynamic) susceptibility χ^0_B,

$$\phi_B(\omega) = \frac{\chi_B(\omega) - \chi^0_B}{\omega}, \qquad \chi^0_B = \int_0^\beta d\tau \langle B^\dagger B(i\tau)\rangle, \quad (8)$$

where $\beta = 1/T$. In an ergodic case $\chi^0_B = \chi_B(\omega \to 0)$, while in a nonergodic system one has to consider also the possibility of $\chi^0_B > \chi_B(\omega \to 0)$. Nevertheless, our study deals with the situation where (at least due to inter-chain coupling) there is a decay towards the equilibrium (thermalization). Due to general equlibrium properties of $\phi_B(\omega)$, we can represent it in terms of the complex memory function[40],

$$\phi_B(\omega) = -\frac{\chi^0_B}{\omega + M(\omega)}. \quad (9)$$

Skipping formal representation for the memory function $M(\omega)$[41,42], we turn directly to the simplified expression valid within the perturbation theory[40],

$$M(\omega) = \frac{\chi_F(z) - \chi_F^0}{\omega \chi_B^0}, \tag{10}$$

where $\chi_F(z)$ is defined in analogy to Eq. (8), for the operator $F = [H, B] = [H'', B]$. The latter represents the effective force on the DW operator B,

$$F = \frac{2U}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{mm'nn's} \chi_{mn}^{m'n'} \zeta_{mm'} \varphi^\dagger_{n',-s} \varphi_{n,-s} \varphi^\dagger_{m's} \varphi_{ms}, \tag{11}$$

where $\zeta_{mm'} = 0$ for even $m' - m$ and $\zeta_{mm'} = (-1)^m$ for odd $m' - m$.

Within the perturbation theory and within the eigenbasis of H_0 we further get

$$\chi_F(\omega) = -\frac{1}{Z} \sum_{\underline{n},\underline{m}} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_{\underline{n}}} - \mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_{\underline{m}}}}{\omega + i(E_{\underline{n}} - E_{\underline{m}})} \, |\langle \underline{n}|F|\underline{m}\rangle|^2 \tag{12}$$

where $Z = \sum_{\underline{m}} \mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_{\underline{m}}}$. For the decay of interest is primarily the low-ω value $\Gamma = M(\omega \to 0)$ (provided that $M(\omega)$ dependence is modest) and for $\omega \ll T$ we obtain,

$$\Gamma = \sum_{\underline{m}} p_{\underline{m}} \Gamma_{\underline{m}},$$
$$\Gamma_{\underline{m}} = \frac{\pi\beta}{\chi_B^0} \sum_{\underline{n}} |\langle \underline{n}|F|\underline{m}\rangle|^2 \delta(E_{\underline{n}} - E_{\underline{m}}), \tag{13}$$

where $p_{\underline{m}} = \mathrm{e}^{-\beta E_{\underline{m}}}/Z$ is the Boltzmann probability and $\Gamma_{\underline{m}}$ are decay rates of particular states. We note that Γ in Eq. (13 takes the simple form of generalized Fermi golden rule (FGR) for the considered problem. It should be noted that such a formulation, taking into account the form Eq. (11), also yields Γ as well as $\Gamma_{\underline{m}}$ as an intensive quantity, i.e. they do not depend of the system size L.

Further simplification can be obtained for high T, i.e., where from Eq. (8) we get

$$\chi_B^0 = \beta \langle B^2 \rangle, \qquad \langle B^2 \rangle = \bar{n}(1 - \bar{n}/2), \tag{14}$$

so that $\Gamma_{\underline{m}}$ are T independent.

IV. DECAY RATE: RESULTS

A. One-dimensional system

Before entering the analysis of the 2D case, we first comment the 1D system (uncoupled chains), and specifically the stability of the DW perturbation in the presence of the Hubbard-type perturbation H_U. In contrast to the prototype interacting spinless models (see e.g. Ref. 18), much less is known on the existence of the nonergodicity within the Hubbard model[24,36,37], whereby the symmetry arguments may imply also the restriction on the MBL physics[39]. Our formulation of the DW decay, Eq. (13), allows some additional insight into the problem by considering the condition for $\Gamma > 0$ in a macroscopic disordered system. While the density of MB states entering Eq. (13) is continuous and dense (for $L \to \infty$), matrix elements $\langle \underline{n}|F|\underline{m}\rangle$ do not connect states with $E_{\underline{n}} \sim E_{\underline{m}}$, since the interaction is local, while degenerate states can appear asymptotically only at large space separation. The interplay and proper treatment of related resonances is in the core of the theory of single-particle localization[1–3] and of the MBL question[4–6,30,43]. Let us consider in Eq. (11) only the dominant (most local) term,

$$F \sim \frac{2U}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{mm's} \tilde{\chi}_{mm'} \zeta_{mm'} \left[\varphi^\dagger_{m's} \varphi_{ms} - \varphi^\dagger_{ms} \varphi_{m's}\right] \tilde{n}_{m,-s}. \tag{15}$$

where $\tilde{\chi}_{mm'} = \chi_{mm'}^{mm} \sim \phi_{mm'}$. Following a simple argument by Mott[2] for 1D non-interacting disordered system, single-particle energies on n.n. sites cannot be close, i.e. $|\epsilon_{m+1} - \epsilon_m| > 2t$. In the same way one can get for more distant neighbors[2],

$$|\epsilon_{m+r} - \epsilon_m| > 2t \exp(-\xi(r-1)), \tag{16}$$

where $\xi \sim \ln(W_0/W)$ is the effective inverse localization length (averaged over band for large enough disorder $W > W_0 \sim 2t$). On the other hand, $\tilde{\chi}_{m,m+r}$ also decays as $\propto \exp(-\xi r)$. So at least for $U \ll t$ we get the answer qualitatively consistent with the nonergodicity of DW correlations, $\Gamma_{\underline{m}} = 0$. On the other hand, large $U > U_c$ (going beyond simple perturbation approach) are expected to lead to an ergodic behavior of DW perturbation with $\Gamma_{\underline{m}} > 0$, although the actual transition is not yet explored in detail within the 1D disordered Hubbard model[24,37].

B. Coupled identical Hubbard chains

The introduction of the inter-chain hopping $t' \neq 0$ in Eq. (1) qualitatively changes the physics in the case of identical disorder in all chains. Without interaction, i.e. at $U = 0$, the eigenstates are a product of localized function and perpendicular plane waves. For simplicity we consider a 2D system, so that

$$H_0|\phi_{mqs}\rangle = (\epsilon_m + \tilde{\epsilon}_q)|\phi_{mqs}\rangle,$$
$$|\phi_{mqs}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{lj} \phi_{ml} \mathrm{e}^{iqj} c^\dagger_{ljs}|0\rangle = \varphi^\dagger_{lqs}|0\rangle, \tag{17}$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_q = -2t' \cos q$ and N is the number of chains. The interaction mixes such states,

$$H_U = \frac{U}{N} \sum_{\substack{mm'nn' \\ qkp}} \chi_{mn}^{m'n'} \varphi^\dagger_{n',k+q\downarrow} \varphi_{nk\downarrow} \varphi^\dagger_{m',p-q\uparrow} \varphi_{mp\uparrow} \tag{18}$$

The essential difference to possible decay in 1D, Eq. (13), is that the inter-chain dispersion leads to a continuous spectrum of overlapping initial and final states, so that the matrix elements in FGR, Eq. (13), can have finite values. Assuming for the moment that we are dealing with a weak perturbation

$U < t'$, the evaluation of Eq. (13) leads to an effective (Boltzmann) density of decay channels, i.e. the density of states $\mathcal{D}(\omega)$, where (at $\beta \to 0$)

$$\mathcal{D}(\omega) = \mu\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\omega), \qquad \mu = (1-\bar{n}/2)^2\bar{n}^2/4,$$
$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{N^3}\sum_{kpq}\delta(\omega - \tilde{\epsilon}_{p-q} - \tilde{\epsilon}_{k+q} + \tilde{\epsilon}_p + \tilde{\epsilon}_k), \quad (19)$$

with $\int d\omega\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\omega) = 1$. Distribution $\mathcal{D}(\omega)$ depends linearly on t' and has a form as shown in Fig. 1, with a singularity at $\omega \sim 0$. It is nonzero within the interval $-8t' < \omega < 8t'$ with a width $\sqrt{\bar{\omega}^2} \sim \sqrt{8}t'$.



Figure 1. (Color online) Effective density of states $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\omega)$, emerging from the inter-chain hopping and entering the evaluation of the decay rate Γ. Plotted is also the incoherent approximant $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_I(\omega)$.

Taking as the main contribution the reduced F, Eq. (15), Γ (at $\beta \to 0$) can be represented as the sum of contributions emerging from different distances r, $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_3 + \cdots$, where

$$\Gamma_r = 32\pi\tilde{\mu}U^2|\tilde{\chi}_{m,m+r}|^2\tilde{\mathcal{D}}(\Delta\epsilon_r = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_{m+r}), \quad (20)$$

and $\tilde{\mu} = \mu/\langle B^2\rangle = \bar{n}(1-\bar{n}/2)/4$.

At least n.n. neighbors $r = 1$ can be calculated more explicitly, taking into account the actual random distribution of h_l. Assuming for simplicity that we are dealing with a two-level non-interacting problem with local potentials h_l, h_{l+1}, respectively, we get

$$\Gamma_1 = 32\pi\tilde{\mu}U^2\int d\tilde{h}|\tilde{\chi}_{m,m+1}(\tilde{h})|^2\mathcal{P}(\tilde{h})\mathcal{D}(\Delta\epsilon_1(\tilde{h})), \quad (21)$$

where $\tilde{h} = h_l - h_{l+1}$. In an analogous way one can treat also further neighbors $r \geq 3$, but here with an additional approximation that the effective in-chain hopping is reduced as $t_r \sim t(2t/W)^{r-1}$.

The displayed result Γ vs. t'/t, as shown in Fig. 2 is calculated using Eq. (21), at fixed $\bar{n} = 1/2$ and for various W/t. In spite of simplified approximations $\chi_{mn}^{m'n'}$ as well as for local energies ϵ_m, several conclusions are straightforward:



Figure 2. (Color online) Decay rate $\Gamma t/U^2$ vs. inter-chain hopping t'/t for different disorders W/t at fixed particle density $\bar{n} = 1/2$.

a) The decay rate becomes $\Gamma > 0$ for any finite $t' \neq 0$ and is proportional to $\bar{n}$ consistent with the origin in the interaction $U > 0$ between fermions. $\Gamma \propto U^2$, at least within the perturbation regime considered analytically.
b) Γ shows a steady increase with $|t'/t|$ for $t'/t < 0.6$, consistent with experiments[33]. The decay rate Γ vs. t'/t is, at least within the approach used, is not a simple function. Namely, for small $t'/t < 0.2$ Γ is strongly reduced since the contributions beyond the n.n. term Γ_1 become suppressed. There appears also a saturation of Γ for $t'/t > 0.6$. To some extent such behavior is plausible since excessively wide bands $t'/t > 1$ cannot increase Γ much further.

C. Generalizations

So far the analysis has been restricted to the regime of weak interaction $U/4 \ll t, t'$, whereby the factor four seems to be a fair estimate for the crossover to a nonperturbative case. Since in the experiment[33] t'/t is also varied, and of particular interest are results with $t'/t \ll 1$, one would wish to have an analytical result for the intermediate regime $t' < U/4 < t$. If we consider in this case just the inter-chain part of the Hamiltonian, Eq. (1) would for $U \gg t'$ transform into

$$H_\perp = \sum_l H_{l\perp}, \qquad H_{l\perp} \sim -t'\sum_{js}(\tilde{c}^\dagger_{l,j+1,s}\tilde{c}_{ljs} + \text{H.c.}), \quad (22)$$

where $\tilde{c}_{ljs} = c_{ljs}(1 - n_{lj,-s})$ are projected fermion operators. Here, we omit possible exchange terms, since we are interested in systems with $\bar{n} < 1/2$, i.e., away from half filling. As before the modified $H_\perp$ commutes with the DW operator, i.e. $[H_\perp, B] = 0$, hence it is expected not to influence significantly the form of F, Eq. (11). It is well known[44] that eigenstates of the projected model, Eq. (22), can be mapped on those of an noninteracting spinless model with the same single-particle dispersion $\epsilon_q = -2t'\cos q$. On the other hand, wavefunctions within the original basis are complicated and



Figure 3. (Color online) Decay rate $\Gamma t/U^2$ vs. t'/t as calculated within the incoherent approximation for different W/t at fixed $\bar{n} = 1/2$.

selection rules changed. We therefore argue that within the intermediate regime the essential difference appears in the evaluation of Eq. (18), whereby the changed coherence factors between q-states and eigenstates of Eq. (22) lead to a different, rather incoherent $\mathcal{D}_I(\omega)$. For simplicity we assume for the latter the Gaussian form with the same width $\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{8}t'$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{D}_I(\omega) = \exp(-\omega^2/(4t')^2)/\sqrt{16\pi t'^2}. \qquad (23)$$

Taking $\mathcal{D}_I(\omega)$ as an input into Eqs. (20),(21) results are presented in Fig. 3. Results differ from those in Fig. 2 only in some details. In particular, due to continuous $\mathcal{D}_I(\omega)$ the variation of Γ vs. t'/t is more gradual, but still showing a distinctive contributions $\Gamma_{r>1}$ with strong W dependence.

The question of strong interactions $U > 4t$ is more subtle. One might employ an approximation similar to Eq. (22) also for the in-chain terms, i.e.,

$$H_j \sim -t\sum_{ls}(\tilde{c}^\dagger_{l+1,js}\tilde{c}_{ljs} + \text{H.c.}) + \sum_l h_i n_{lj}. \qquad (24)$$

The message of such term is that the decay rate Γ would not increase with $U > 4t$, but would saturate being finally determined by t, as emerging from Eq. (24), as well as on t' and W. Taking strictly 1D model, as described by Eq. (24), DW perturbation should not decay at all due to the mapping on the spinless fermions and on the non-interacting Anderson model. Still, $t' \neq 0$ and the emerging 2D problem does not have such a mapping, so that inter-chain and in-chain fermion states become coupled again.

V. CONCLUSIONS

.

We presented a theory of a DW decay in the case of coupled disordered Hubbard chains, with the identical disorder in each chain. It should be pointed out that we do not address the question whether the uncoupled 1D chains already show weak DW decay, but rather discuss the nontrivial additional contribution due to the inter-chain coupling. From the perturbation theory approach the decay emerges due to Hubbard interaction $U > 0$ mixing the in-chain localized states and inter-chain extended single-fermion states. The essential ingredient for $\Gamma > 0$ (given by transition rates between discrete localized states) are continuous spectra of overlapping extended states, i.e. with finite matrix elements . The latter are the the precondition for an evaluation of Γ within a FGR-type approximation. Taking into account that levels localized close in space are (on average) distant in energy, this leads to quite strong dependence of Γ on the ratio t'/t as well as on an increase of Γ with decreasing disorder W. The nontrivial structure within the dependence on t'/t emerges from a different regimes which allow for contributions beyond first n.n. in Eq. (20). The saturation of Γ at $t'/t \sim 1$ is to some extent plausible since for $t' > t$ the decay is limited by t and not by t', but can be also beyond the feasibility of initial assumptions. An interesting question is also to what extent the DW decay Γ and possible MBL are sensitive to the difference of potentials in each chain[45], since even a small difference $\delta\epsilon > t'$ can induce also perpendicular localization and prevent the DW decay discussed above.

The theory is motivated by a concrete experiment on cold atoms[33]. We find that the variation of Γ, as measured via the time-dependent imbalance $I(\tau)$ with U as well as on t'/t and W are qualitatively reasonably reproduced. Still, several restrictions on the theoretical description should be taken into account. In actual experiment a quasi-periodic (Aubry-Andrè) lattice is employed which is different from an Anderson model with respect to the character and stability of localized states. Also, most results are available within the strong-interaction regime $U \gg 4t$ where we cannot give an explanation on the same level of validity, although the saturation (or a maximum) of Γ for $U > 4t$ is expected.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledges the explanation of cold-atom experiments by P. Bordia and H. Lüschen within the group of I. Bloch, LMU München, and fruitful discussions with F. Heidrich-Meisner and F. Pollmann. The author acknowledges also the support of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, as well the hospitality of the A. Sommerfeld Center for the Theoretical Physics, LMU München, and the Max-Planck Institute for Complex Systems, Dresden, where this work has been started and major steps have been accomplished.

[1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).
[2] N. F. Mott, Phil. Mag. **17**, 1259 (1968).
[3] B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon, Rep. Prog. Phys. **56**, 1469 (1993).
[4] L. Fleishman and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 2366 (1980).
[5] D. Basko, I. Aleiner, and B. Altshuler, Ann. Phys. **321**, 1126 (2006).
[6] V. Oganesyan and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 155111 (2007).
[7] M. Žnidarič, T. Prosen, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 064426 (2008).
[8] C. Monthus and T. Garel, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 134202 (2010).
[9] T. C. Berkelbach and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 224429 (2010).
[10] O. S. Barišić and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 161106 (2010).
[11] A. Pal and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 174411 (2010).
[12] J. H. Bardarson, F. Pollmann, and J. E. Moore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 017202 (2012).
[13] M. Serbyn, Z. Papić, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 127201 (2013).
[14] S. Bera, H. Schomerus, F. Heidrich-Meisner, and J. H. Bardarson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 046603 (2015).
[15] D. J. Luitz, N. Laflorencie, and F. Alet, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 081103 (2015).
[16] K. Agarwal, S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Knap, M. Müller, and E. Demler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 160401 (2015).
[17] A. Lazarides, A. Das, and R. Moessner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 030402 (2015).
[18] S. Gopalakrishnan, M. Müller, V. Khemani, M. Knap, E. Demler, and D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 104202 (2015).
[19] Y. Bar Lev, G. Cohen, and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 100601 (2015).
[20] R. Steinigeweg, J. Herbrych, F. Pollmann, and W. Brenig, arXiv:1512.08519.
[21] O. S. Barišić, J. Kokalj, I. Balog, and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 045126 (2016).
[22] M. Kozarzewski, P. Prelovšek, and M. Mierzejewski, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 235151 (2016).
[23] Y. Bar Lev and D. R. Reichman, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 220201 (2014).
[24] M. Schreiber, S. S. Hodgman, P. Bordia, H. P. Lüschen, M. H. Fischer, R. Vosk, E. Altman, U. Schneider, and I. Bloch, Science **349**, 842 (2015).
[25] M. Serbyn, Z. Papić, and D. A. Abanin, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 041047 (2015).
[26] V. Khemani, R. Nandkishore, and S. L. Sondhi, Nat. Phys. **11**, 560 (2015).
[27] D. J. Luitz, N. Laflorencie, and F. Alet, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 060201 (2015).
[28] J. A. Kjäll, J. H. Bardarson, and F. Pollmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 107204 (2014).
[29] D. A. Huse, R. Nandkishore, V. Oganesyan, A. Pal, and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 014206 (2013).
[30] R. Vosk, D. A. Huse, and E. Altman, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 031032 (2015).
[31] A. C. Potter, R. Vasseur, and S. A. Parameswaran, Phys. Rev. X **5**, 1 (2015).
[32] S. S. Kondov, W. R. McGehee, W. Xu, and B. DeMarco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 083002 (2015).
[33] P. Bordia, H. P. Lüschen, S. S. Hodgman, M. Schreiber, I. Bloch, and U. Schneider, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 140401 (2016).
[34] J.-y. Choi, S. Hild, J. Zeiher, P. Schauß, A. Rubio-Abadal, T. Yefsah, V. Khemani, D. A. Huse, I. Bloch, and C. Gross, Science **352**, 1547 (2016).
[35] E. Baygan, S. P. Lim, and D. N. Sheng, Physical Review B **92**, 195153 (2015).
[36] Y. Bar Lev and D. R. Reichman, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **113**, 46001 (2016).
[37] R. Mondaini and M. Rigol, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 041601(R) (2015).
[38] M. D. Reichl and E. J. Mueller, Physical Review A - Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics **93**, 1 (2016).
[39] A. C. Potter and R. Vasseur, arXiv:1605.03601.
[40] W. Götze and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **6**, 1226 (1972).
[41] H. Mori, Prog. Theor. Phys. **33**, 423 (1965).
[42] D. Forster, *Hydrodynamic Fluctuations, Broken Symmetry, And Correlation Functions* (Westview Press, New York, 1995).
[43] J. Z. Imbrie, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 027201 (2016).
[44] M. Ogata and H. Shiba, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 2326 (1990).
[45] M. Kasner and W. Weller, Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) **148**, 635 (1988).